

## **NORTHGATE STAKEHOLDERS GROUP MEETING SUMMARY**

**North Seattle Community College  
ED 2843A in the Dr. Peter Ku Education Building  
Thursday, June 24, 2004, 4:00 pm – 7:20 pm**

---

The Northgate Stakeholders Group (Group) held its sixth meeting at North Seattle Community College on Thursday, June 24, 2004 from 4:00 pm to 7:00 pm. The purposes of the meeting were to:

- Approve meeting summary #5;
- Review the Stakeholders Group Charter and Workplan;
- Discuss and formulate advice on the coordinated site agreement for the South Lot;
- Discuss and formulate advice concerning the CTIP scope of work; and
- Discuss and formulate advice concerning inclusion of NACP goals and policies into the City's Comprehensive Plan.

### **Welcome/Agenda Review/Meeting Summary**

#### ***Welcome, Chair Ron LaFayette***

Ron LaFayette welcomed the Stakeholders Group to its sixth meeting and invited members to enjoy refreshments from the Berkshire Grill provided by Shaiza Damji on behalf of the Northgate Chamber of Commerce. He invited anyone who wanted to offer public comment to sign up to speak.

#### ***June 28 City Council Committee of the Whole and Public Hearing***

The Chair reported that Seattle City Councilmember Peter Steinbrueck had called earlier in the day to invite him to a Council of the Whole meeting at 3:00 PM to discuss informally the work of the Stakeholders Group has been doing as well as to attend a public hearing at 4:00 PM where he will present the advice the Group has developed. He invited the Group to attend.

#### ***Stakeholders Group Timeframe and Workplan***

The Chair reported that he had briefly discussed with Councilmember Steinbrueck the length of time the Stakeholders Group would exist. While no "official" time has been designated, he indicated his sense that the Group's longevity would be defined by the needs of the City. He noted that the Group had already provided advice on South Lot drainage options (at its last meeting) and he anticipated it would reach closure on advice concerning the Coordinated Site Agreement (between the City and Lorig) and the Coordinated Transportation Investment Plan (CTIP) consultant scope of work at this meeting.

Alice Shorett, meeting facilitator, then reviewed the Group's workplan for the remainder of 2004. She indicated that the Group would hear presentations at its July 22 meeting on the Lorig development and on the Northgate Mall. At its September meeting, the Group would formulate ideas on these two developments and finalize advice in October. She also noted that the schedule might shift, depending upon the schedule of development plans. Gary Weber indicated that Simon Properties presentation on Northgate Mall would be tentative because tenants are still being identified and tenant needs will drive the designs.

The facilitator indicated that the workplan for the remainder of 2004 and 2005 would focus on milestones in the CTIP scope of work, resulting in meetings on roughly a quarterly basis. She said it was expected that a subcommittee would develop materials to bring to Stakeholders Group meetings.

There was agreement from the Group to having the Chair share this timeline with the City.

*Meeting Summary for June 3, 2004*

The meeting summary for June 3 was approved with one correction: on page 4, the value of the 2.7 acres the City has an option to purchase should have read \$4.5 million, not \$450 million.

The Chair invited anyone who wanted to comment during the public comment period to sign up.

**Discussion and Completion of Advice #2: Memorandum of Understanding on a Coordinated Site Agreement between Seattle Public Utilities and Lorig Associates**

The facilitator briefly described the process by which the draft advice had been prepared. It included a discussion by the Group on June 3 when the Group had flagged issues and a subsequent email from David Harrison asking for responses to four questions. The responses he received related primarily to the issue of prevailing wages. He drafted advice on the Coordinated Site Agreement that included two positions the Group requested at the June 3 meeting – Position A and Position B -- drafted by Brad Larssen and Debra Fulton, respectively.

*Lorig Development, Assessment of Traffic Impacts, and the Design Review Process*

The Chair asked the Group if there were any other issues to be considered. In response a member commented that the MOU contained nothing about traffic analysis and mitigation that she felt should have been addressed. Following discussion about the relevance of this issue to the Coordinated Site Agreement, Scott Kemp, Senior Planner at the Department of Planning and Development (DPD), and Diane Sugimura, DPD Director, described the multiple processes that the Lorig development would be subject to, including the Design Review process, environmental review, and permitting. It was clarified that an analysis of traffic impacts would be part of the review.

In response to a question about the authority of the Design Review Board, it was clarified that DPD did carefully consider the Board's advice and that if advice were shared by four of

five members, it could not easily be overruled. Ms. Sugimura of DPD and Mary Jean Ryan of the Office of Policy and Management (OPM) assured the Group that it would have opportunities to comment on the Lorig development.

Later in the meeting, a member asked about how the Group would be able to understand the impacts of the Lorig development on traffic if the Lorig Master Use Permit was to be finished by January 2005 while the CTIP would not end until fall of 2005. Mr. Kemp indicated that the same consultant was going to conduct traffic analysis for the Lorig development and for CTIP, which, it was expected, would result in efficiencies in analysis and identification of mitigations.

Ms. Sugimura said that, with or without CTIP, environmental review of the Lorig project would require traffic analysis and mitigation; CTIP, she said, would look at a larger area. She said that the City could not put a project on hold while the larger study was completed.

The member again expressed concern that approval of the Lorig project was scheduled to occur before CTIP would be completed which would mean that a decision on an important piece of the larger picture would be made before the overall Plan was completed. Bruce Lorig agreed that this was an important question. He said that if the Group said his development could not go forward, he would have to go back to Simon Properties and request a delay.

Mr. Kemp indicated that Lorig was requesting a “contract” rezone that would apply to one building. Because of the drainage system, the building was to be built 20 feet below grade; the contract rezone would allow construction of a six-story building. In response to a concern about the Group’s ability to comment on the rezone request, it was clarified that both the Stakeholders Group and the Design Review Board would have a model to review and could request mitigation if appropriate.

In comments to the Group, Mr. Lorig said that he considered the Design Review Board an important group, one which he felt had “veto authority.” He said he shared the Group’s frustration at the lack of a concrete plan. In addition to working with the City, he said he had to work with prospective tenants. He said that his ideas for retail were collapsing because they had been unable to find commercial tenants; instead, the number of residential units was increasing.

In response to a question, Mr. Kemp indicated that the timeline for a project was driven by the applicant and that projects could take a year.

The Group supported a request from a member who wanted to be sure there was coordination between the Design Review process and the Stakeholders Group process. The Group also supported including language proposed by Bob Vreeland concerning a commitment to continuing review of the development by citizens of Northgate through the Northgate Stakeholders process or other appropriate method if the Northgate Stakeholders Group disbanded.

It was moved and seconded to adopt the advice introduction, as amended. The vote passed unanimously.

### ***Discussion of Positions A and B***

The Chair then invited Brad Larssen and Debra Fulton to describe the position (noted as Position A and B) each had drafted. Brad indicated that the positions began similarly but that they diverged in later paragraphs. Position A, which he had drafted, focused on protecting community benefits; it did not talk about labor, prevailing wages or apprenticeships. He indicated that support for Position A would make the talks between Lorig and the Building Trades Council go better.

Debra Fulton passed around a revised version of Position B that she had developed in consultation with John Lombard. The revised Position B focused specifically on the Lorig project rather than on projects in general. She said that she agreed with an email to the Group from Gary Weber who felt this issue was beyond the scope of issues that the City Council had asked the Stakeholders Group to address.

The Chair asked Ms. Ryan of OPM to reiterate points she had made concerning the Lorig development at the Group's June 3 meeting. Ms. Ryan said that City lawyers disagreed with Mr. Larssen about whether or not the Lorig project should be seen as a public project but that the City shared a preference for liveable wages and that Lorig had agreed to talk to the Building Trades Council. She referenced a letter from the Building Trades Council about those talks that had been provided in the Group's packets.

It was moved and seconded that the Stakeholders Group should adopt the revised Position B. After discussion of process when another motion was proposed and subsequently withdrawn, the Group voted on Positions A and B, with the following results<sup>1</sup>:

- Position A: 4 votes
- Position B: 12 votes
- Abstentions: 2

After additional discussion, the facilitator pointed out that the Group's ground rules specified that when the Group failed to reach consensus, "a single statement of advice, encompassing both issues on which there is agreement and issues on which there are different perspectives" would be provided to the City. It was agreed that the Group's advice would reflect the results of the vote.

### **Discussion and Completion of Advice #3: CTIP Consultant Scope of Work**

The facilitator noted that Advice #3 was on the consultant scope of work for CTIP. She reviewed the process which had led to the draft advice, including the Group's discussions at meetings and a subcommittee meeting which had been well-attended. She pointed out that consultant scope of work had already been refined as a result of the Group's comments and

---

<sup>1</sup> Four of the 22 seats were not represented at the meeting.

that the draft advice included a schedule for future involvement by the Group at key milestones.

She introduced Susan Sanchez, Director of Policy, Planning & Major Projects Division within the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT), who introduced Tony Mazzella and Julie Matlick of her staff.

### ***Subcommittee Report***

The Chair then asked Shaiza Damji to give a report of the CTIP Subcommittee's work. Ms. Damji reported two major themes from the subcommittee's meeting. The first was a request for materials that would help the Group understand what the scope of work would mean in practice. In response SDOT had taken the issue of sidewalks on NE First Ave. as an example and shown how the work would occur. SDOT had also provided a schedule for how the Group would be involved over time. The second theme was understanding that the Group was being asked to vote on the consultant's scope of work and the proposed public involvement process.

Ms. Damji explained that David Harrison of the facilitation team had attended the subcommittee meeting, drafted advice for review by subcommittee attendees, made revisions based on their input, and sent the draft advice to the Group. In the end, she said, the subcommittee felt they were not giving a judgment on the specifics of the workplan but rather indicating that the process made sense. The draft advice identified the general topics the Group wanted SDOT and its consultants to focus on. She said the Subcommittee also thought the work on pedestrian circulation should be incorporated into CTIP.

The facilitator noted a correction in the draft advice: CTIP is to be completed in December 2005, not February 2006.

Questions and comments, along with responses, were as follows:

*Question:* Why is this study taking until December 2005?

*Response:* Tony Mazzella responded that CTIP is a complicated project that involves an aggressive and intense level of public involvement. He noted that there is a rich tradition of planning in Northgate that provides a lot of information but time is needed to match it with technical updates so the information will meet the test of time. In the end, he said, they want to produce a real consensus document that reflects community issues and that lays out a strategy for implementation of projects.

Julie Matlick indicated that December was the longest the project would take; it is possible, she said, that it could be completed before then, possibly in September.

*Question:* How will CTIP coordinate with the Lorig development? Is CTIP meant to replace the Comprehensive Plan EIS?

*Response:* Tony Mazaella replied that, with or without CTIP, if a development comes forward, the City needs to address it. With respect to the Lorig development, he said, that it was not a perfect lineup timewise but the fact that CTIP was beginning along with the Lorig development was better than if there were no CTIP. He added that

CTIP has a programmatic EIS as one of its components. He felt this was added value to the community because CTIP would update and refresh that document.

*Question:* If a Hearings Examiner were to ask how all of this fits with the Comprehensive Plan, with the CTIP EIS not yet ready and the other one “blown up,” what would a Hearings Examiner have to go by?

*Response:* Scott Kemp replied that when a Master Use Permit or MUP comes to DPD, the Department has to make a threshold determination: a determination of significance (DS) or a determination of non-significance (DNS). If the result is a DS, then an environmental impact statement or EIS must be prepared. He concluded that Lorig had the right to apply and the Department has to make that determination.

*Question:* If and how does a Planned Action EIS relate to CTIP?

*Response:* With CTIP, the idea of a Planned Action EIS is that there would be a big overall EIS for an area and a period of time.

*Comment:* Janice Camp expressed her appreciation to Tony Mazzella and the consultant who met with her separately since she was unable to attend the subcommittee meeting. She indicated that she was happy with the scope in its current form but was also concerned about the length of time it would take. With the same consultant responsible for CTIP and the Lorig development, she expressed hope that the project could be completed sooner than projected. She added that it was great to do the studies but she was frustrated that the City never did anything with the study results. She asked how the Group could signal the City that it was important that things actually got implemented.

*Response:* Ms. Sanchez noted that the project was complicated but said that, once the project got underway, if they figured out a way to do things more quickly, they would.

### ***Vote on CTIP***

Ms. Damji indicated that the subcommittee had not voted but she believed the subcommittee supported the consultant scope of work.

Members offered the following comments on draft advice #3:

- The discussions about timeline should be acknowledged and a phrase added that the City should speed up the timeline to the extent possible.
- The City should take the results of CTIP seriously and actually implement the recommendations that result from the Plan.
- Bicycles were suggested to be added to the list of modes to be addressed for connecting the east and west sides of I-5.
- It was suggested that “and traffic” be added to the bullet, “Response to parking related to the Lorig development,” to address concerns about coordination between the Lorig development and CTIP.
- The words in the first line of the advice “is comfortable with” were recommended to be replaced by “accepts.”

The Group agreed to these changes and voted unanimously to approve advice #3 as amended.

Ms. Sanchez thanked Group members for all of the time they had spent on this issue. She said that they had made an important investment and that SDOT looked forward to working with them. Ms. Matlick expressed her appreciation for the time already spent and the time that would be spent in the future.

## **Break**

### **Inclusion of Northgate Area Comprehensive Plan (NACP) into the City's Comprehensive Plan – Advice #4**

After a brief break, the Chair introduced Rebecca Herzfeld of the City Council Central Staff who had met with a subcommittee twice since the June 3 meeting to develop materials on this issue to bring to the meeting.

#### ***Subcommittee Report***

Velva Maye gave a brief report of the subcommittee meetings. At the June 8 meeting, she noted that six members of the Group had attended; at the June 15, three members had attended. The purpose of the meetings, she said, was to review inclusion of Northgate goals and policies into the City's Comprehensive Plan, which required some word changes because some actions in the NACP had been completed. She indicated that the subcommittee had not voted but that members had agreed with the revised wording.

Bob Vreeland, alternate, indicated that he had submitted the revised language on drainage to the Thornton Creek Legal Defense land use attorney and would abstain from a vote until he received a response from the attorney.

Ms. Herzfeld walked the Group through the sections where wording changed but asked that they exclude Policy 8 from the discussions. (See below.)

The Chair proposed that the Group vote on all the changes except Policy 8. The results of the vote were as follows:

- In favor: 15
- Abstentions: 3

#### ***Policy 8 and Issues related to Single Family Zoning***

There was discussion about whether or not a specific rezone proposal (from Howland Homes) should be included in a general document such as the City's Comprehensive Plan. Derek Berkhind, a representative from Howland Homes, briefly described the property that Howland Homes had requested be rezoned and its proposal for dwellings to be built on site. Points raised in the subsequent discussion addressed the specific rezone request from Howland Homes, the benefits of allowing diverse kinds of buildings in Northgate, the need to be able to make decisions about land that is vacant, and the need for a decision about the transition point from higher density to single family residential. It was agreed that the subcommittee would meet with Ms. Herzfeld again to address the questions raised by Group members on this issue.

as well as on SEPA compliance, to review draft language Ms. Herzfeld would prepare, and bring information on this set of issues and SEPA compliance to the July 22 meeting.

### **Open Space and Pedestrian Circulation**

Lyle Bicknell, urban designer at DPD, noted that the Northgate Framework Resolution had directed specific city departments to work together to develop a plan to increase open space and pedestrian connections. He said that DPD was working with Marty Curry, Executive Director of the Planning Commission, Don Harris who heads Parks Acquisition at Seattle Parks, and SDOT and that the Pedestrian Connections Workshop in March had kicked off the process which resulted in a synthesis of desired pedestrian connections and open space.

He directed the Group to a map of the Northgate Overlay District and a matrix of open space and pedestrian connections in their packets. The improvements were color-coded based on an estimate of whether they could be implemented in the near-term or were likely to be longer-term. When final, he said, that the matrix would indicate likely implementing agencies.

Mr. Harris noted that a few things had been left off, including the Victory Creek Park, Licton Springs Park and the Pinehurst Pocket Park. He said they felt the best approach was to link up Thornton Creek and to recognize the importance of the future park north of Northgate Way.

Ms. Curry indicated that the graphic was a beginning and that the Group's input was needed on four questions:

- Are the policies appropriate and sufficient; do they cover everything needed relative to open space and pedestrian connections?
- Are the recommendations for immediate rather than longer-term implementation right? That is, what does the Group want to see now?
- Is the list of implementers on the matrix comprehensive?
- How does the Stakeholders Group want to be involved: via presentations and discussions at future Group meetings, via a subcommittee that will bring materials back to the Group, or via reading materials with email responses?

A member asked a question about the difference between a "key bike street" and a "bike route." Mr. Bicknell responded that the designations were from the City's Comprehensive Plan and that they perhaps needed more consideration.

The Chair indicated that the full Group (representatives and alternates) would be polled to see who wanted to meet in a subcommittee to develop responses to the four questions Ms. Curry posed.

### **Announcements about Events at Northgate**

Mark Troxel announced that the groundbreaking ceremony for the library and community center would be on July 24. He said that the Stakeholders Group could have a table there, if the members chose to.



A member asked a question about how people on the Stakeholders Group could be replaced if the Group were going to continue through 2005. It was agreed that this issue would be discussed at the July 22 meeting.

### **Public Comment**

No one signed up or asked to offer public comment.

### **Wrap Up**

The Chair noted that the Group had accomplished a great deal at its meeting and adjourned the meeting at 7:20 PM.

### **Meeting Attendance**

Representatives and Alternates of the **Northgate Stakeholders Group** in attendance were:

**Simon Properties:** Rep. Gary Weber, Alt. Sam Stalin

**Maple Leaf Community Council:** Rep. Janice Camp, Alt. Mel Vannice

**Licton Springs Community Council:** Rep. Shannon Snider

**Haller Lake Community Council:** Rep. Velva Maye, Alt. Sue Geving

**Pinehurst Community Council:** Rep. Lorna Mrachek

**Victory Heights Community Council:** Rep. Brad Cummings

**Northgate Chamber of Commerce:** Rep. Shaiza Damji, Alt. Scott Greer

**Thornton Creek Alliance:** Rep. John Lombard

**Thornton Creek Legal Defense Fund:** Alt. Bob Vreeland

**North Seattle Community College:** Rep. Ronald LaFayette, Alt. Bruce Kieser

**Owners of Three or More Acres:** Rep. Kevin Wallace, Alt. Rodney Russell

**Senior Housing:** Rep. Jeanne Hayden, Alt. Sandra Morgan

**Renters/Condominium Owners:** Rep. Debra Fulton, Alt. Brad Mason

**Multi-family Housing Developers:** Rep. Colleen Mills, Alt. Tom Donnelly

**Businesses Inside the Mall:** Rep. Kurt Schaueremann

**Labor:** Rep. Brad Larssen, Alt. David Helene

**At-large:** Rep. Shawn Olesen

**At-large:** Rep. Marilyn Firlotte, Alt. Mike Vincent

Members of the Triangle Associates facilitation team included: Alice Shorett and Vicki King.